

LONG RANGE PLANNING

TO: Growth Management Steering Committee
FROM: Long Range Planning Staff
DATE: November 20, 2002
SUBJECT: Summary Notes from the GMA Steering Committee meeting of
November 20, 2002 (Meeting #30)

Attendance:

Steering Committee Members:

Michael Hefflin	City of Ridgefield Council Member
John Idsinga	City of Battle Ground Council Member
Betty Sue Morris	Clark County Board of Commissioners
Craig Pridemore	Clark County Board of Commissioners
Judie Stanton	Clark County Board of Commissioners (Chair)
Jeanne Stewart	City of Vancouver Council Member

Public:

Marnie Allen	Consortium of Clark County Schools
Laurabelle Dewell	La Center Citizens Committee
Ken Hadley	Self
Patrick Holmes	Lane Powell Spears Lubersky
Julius Horvath	Hockinson South Homeowners Association
James Howsley	Lane Powell Spears Lubersky
Bruce Lindoff	Self
John Mc Kibbin	InterACT
Randy Printz	Landerholm Law Firm
Don Wastler	Self

Staff:

Bill Barron	Clark County Administrator
Rich Carson	Clark County Community Development
Derek Chisholm	Clark County Long Range Planning
Eric Eisemann	Cities of La Center & Ridgefield
LeAnne Forney	Clark County Public Outreach & Information Director
Bob Higbie	Clark County Long Range Planning
Mary Keltz	Clark County Board of Commissioner's Office

Denny Kiggins	Hazel Dell Sewer District - Commissioner
Patrick Lee	Clark County Long Range Planning Manager
Rich Lowry	Clark County Chief Civil Deputy Prosecuting Attorney
Samuel Lowry	City of Vanouwer Long Range Planning
Oliver Orjiako	Clark County Long Range Planning
Rod Orlando	Town of Yacolt – EES Consulting
Matt Ransom	City of Vancouver Transportation
Marty Snell	City of Camas Planner
Bryan Snodgrass	City of Vancouver Planner
Deb Wallace	Washington Department of Transportation
Josh Warner	Clark County Community Development
Phil Weist	City of Vancouver Transportation

1. Introductions

Everyone introduced himself or herself.

2. Review August 21, 2002 meeting notes

Accepted as distributed.

3. Presentation: Transportation Priorities Project: Dream It/Fund It/ Build It. A Community Priorities and Design Initiative for Clark County (John McKibbin)

John Mc Kibbin with InterACT presented. A handout was passed around. The coalition is looking broadly at transportation needs and wants for the county, and how to get there. InterACT is a citizen led organization. The process began in December 2001. Meetings have been held around the county. There have been approximately 500 people involved to date. An electronic voting process has been used to collect data. A summit is being held this Saturday for more community involvement. The purpose is to confirm priorities and look at macro issues including I-5 plans etc. Why did R-51 fail will be one of the questions that is looked at in the meeting. Elected officials will be involved and will react to the ideas. The agenda for the day is in the handout.

Some of the results of voting from previous meetings are as follows. Transportation generally is performing adequately. The transportation to Oregon is doing poorly. Neighborhoods are doing well. Improvements can come in funding and spending. It is not clear what these results mean. Capacity is also a concern. Freight mobility ranked very low in importance from the citizens. People are willing to vote for public/private partnerships, similar to Airport Max. Next is imposing system development charges. Also local improvement districts. Low were new taxes and miles driven fees. If taxes must be imposed, a regional gas tax topped the list. Additional sales, property taxes are not favored.

It should be clear this is not a scientific process. It is self-selected people who are interested in the issue. There will be a final report shared with policymakers to help shape planning in the future.

The “Build It” process is the final portion. Mc Kibbin is on the Steering Committee for this process. The only disappointment has been they would like more people to participate.

Stanton commented that there were a number of local meetings and the voting took place with limited info. Regional meetings provided more information to the voters. Mc Kibbin said the summit will provide even more information to help people decide. Idsinga asked about the size of area meetings. Mc Kibbin said they ranged from 3-15 people. One other insight is that young people do not like gas taxes.

Ken Hadley commented about the commercial traffic issue. This traffic seems to be doing well so it is not currently a priority. Another failing is that costs are not associated with the options. Mc Kibbin said it was designed this way and the summit will provide more information on costs – the what and the how. Stanton asked how specific it can be. Mc Kibbin said there will not be that much detail. That will be a future project for 2003.

Weist asked about funding mechanisms. Mc Kibbin said that the apparent contradictions in funding and desires changed as more information was provided. The size of the projects is key to what and how it can be solved. Stanton asked if cities are asking citizens about this. The response was no. Idsinga said there is nothing on the drawing board for initiatives in the near future. He thinks education is key. Pridemore commented on regionalism. Local level is easier to take care of, but it is braking down at the state level. At some point regionalism is necessary to take care of specific issues. We need to think about regional issues and regional funding. Stanton said we would need to go together to get enough taxing authority. Pridemore emphasized that the tax dollars now going to the state would also need to stay here.

Stewart said Vancouver has been doing some work, but it is still preliminary. The city is taking steps to evaluate transportation funding. Ransom said that there is a shortfall in funding for building new facilities. They are working on a package to put forward to the council or the citizens. The city sees it as a responsibility to fund some regional projects. In 2004 the city is starting to run out of money for new capital facilities with current funding sources. Stanton asked about regional projects. Ransom responded that they will try to budget \$1-2 million for regional projects on an annual basis. Pridemore is concerned about jurisdictions having to bribe the state to do projects and that the Seattle/King County will outbid our region for projects. It needs to be done on a strategic level. There are some forum available. Mc Kibbin responded that the citizens do not look at the political boundaries. Can the jurisdictions work together to build regional projects? One intent of the surveys is to find out who is expected to do the work. Pridemore responded that there will need to be a governing body regardless of what the citizens decide they want. Mc Kibbin stressed that representatives need to be respected to lead. Coalition politics are what is needed to succeed. Tort reform is an example of a broad-based coalition. The coalition must be public and private. Stewart commented that the final outcome will provide interesting information for local governments to use. She wants to see how it translates to past experiences. Mc Kibbin commented that the legitimacy of the process will need to be confirmed by those elected officials being present at the summit.

4. Consider process developing criteria for selecting a preferred plan alternative

There is a need to decide how to choose the preferred alternative for the EIS. Lee provided the background. Staff will analyze the five alternatives to help move toward the preferred alternative. It seems that the credibility of the public process would be furthered by involving the Steering Committee and other service providers (C-Tran, Utility Districts, school districts, etc.). There has been some representation at the TAC level of service providers. Morris asked about the timeline in deciding. Stanton responded it could be done in a Steering Committee meeting. The committee would only provide guidelines on choosing the alternative. Comments on the EIS and the fiscal info will also provide guidance in selecting the preferred alternative. Lee said we are looking at providing info to staff and the preferred alternative would be chosen by April or May. The guidance would need to be given by February. Idsinga asked about timeline. Lee responded that the FEIS needs to be done by Fall 2003. Morris asked if the guidance on the preferred alternative can happen in December. Lee said the info from the EIS will not be out until February. Hefflin asked about the alternatives. Lee responded that the EIS will review all five alternatives and they are being considered equally. Stanton said that the outcome will likely be a combination of the choices. Hefflin commented that there is no reason to delay the discussion. He is concerned about his staff being educated about the alternatives. Alternative 5 seems to be rising to the top. Lee responded that the alternatives at this point are at a very basic level of detail. Stanton asked Lee about his recommendation for timing. Lee responded that if more info is better, than wait for the EIS to be published. The FEIS can realign the alternatives to meet the guidance that is given. Morris stated that it would be better to do it in January if all you want a broad range of input for guidance. Stanton agrees. This issue will be on the agenda in January.

5. Consider a process for developing a countywide economic development plan, using the CREDC proposal as a starting point

An attachment was provided in the e-mail notice on this. It is desired that the Comp Plan contain more of a strategic outline for economic development in the county. An outline of potential meetings for input from the jurisdictions is on the back of the meeting handout. They will likely take place in January and early-February. Comments are expected.

Hadley asked if the meetings are open to the public. Stanton responded that it is more for elected officials and staff. The feedback will be used for the public process.

Pridemore asked about the targeted investment analysis. Lee responded that the analysis is being done. Pridemore asked about the geographic component of the economic development. Lee said the info will be completed after January through the EIS process. Morris commented that part of the capital facilities process is looking at where the money will go. It all needs to be integrated with the EIS and the boundary movements. She is concerned that there be a discussion about whether the data will inform the process or if the cities will stick with what they have always individually wanted. How can we work more regionally? It is something that the city representatives should be discussing at the city council level. Pridemore thinks we need the cost-benefit information to inform the discussion. Lee said that the targeted investment areas will be in the EIS. What is the

targeted investment all about? Lee responded that it is industrial nodes and if they will be in UGB expansion areas. Also, what will the job creation benefits be and what services are required? It included tax base analysis. About 15 areas are being examined. Stanton stated that the dates may need to be revised so this information is available.

6. TAC update

Some discussion has been over allocations. Staff will be trying to identify the issue areas to benefit the guidance discussion.

7. Next meeting date and time

There will be no December meeting. The next meeting will be January 15.

8. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 5:25 PM.

h:\long range planning\projects\cpt 99.003 five year update\cpt 99-003 - steering committee\minutes - steering\steering committee - November 20 2002(#30).doc